

The University of Chicago

THE REACTION OF AMERICAN
PROTESTANT CHURCHES TO THE
DARWINIAN PHILOSOPHY
1860-1900

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
1936

By
WINDSOR HALL ROBERTS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1938

The University of Chicago

**THE REACTION OF AMERICAN
PROTESTANT CHURCHES TO THE
DARWINIAN PHILOSOPHY
1860-1900**

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
1936

By
WINDSOR HALL ROBERTS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1938



PREFACE

The study of the reaction of the American Protestant Churches to the Darwinian Philosophy between 1860 and 1900, of which this is an abstract, is limited primarily to the churches in the northern part of the United States. The northern Protestant churches have been treated as a whole for there was found no logical way to eliminate one group from the controversy. The struggle against or for evolution was primarily an intellectual contest in the North rather than a use of ecclesiastical government to crush a heresy. The ideas flowed freely from one group to another and were used sometimes better by one group and again by another. Although the northern churches have been treated as a unit the writer has concentrated on the efforts of the five denominations which took the most important part in the controversy, namely: Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Unitarian.

March, 1936
Hillsdale, Michigan

W.H.R.

THEOLOGICAL ASSAULT UPON DARWINISM

Into a theological atmosphere already surcharged with supersensitiveness over the inroads of geological science, burst the evolutionary theory of Darwin in the fall of 1859. The development theory had had a rather long and dubious past. It had arisen time after time to create a brief and frantic sensation, only to be condemned and assigned to the limbo of scientific speculation by the more cautious and conservative doctors of science.¹ When Darwin's theory appeared, theologians and theologico-minded scientists, taking their cue from the past, endeavored to discredit completely the theory as a scientific hypothesis. Soon after the work reached America a furious assault upon its scientific standing was launched by some of the ablest American theologians and by laymen writing in the defense of theology. The scientific weakness of former theories, with which they confused Darwin's hypothesis, made it most natural for them to anticipate the same fate for this newest attempt to revive the old evolutionary theory. An illusory optimism pervaded their thinking as they contemplated the easy victory over this unworthy foe. The weak points in the Darwinian armor were sought out and developed to the full. Cogent arguments, mixed with burlesque, ridicule, and sarcasm, were heaped upon the theory to make it as discreditable as possible in the eyes of the reading public.²

¹Henry F. Osborn, From the Greeks to Darwin An Outline of the Development of the Evolution Idea (New York, 1913).

²Among the early criticism of Darwinism worthy of note may be listed the following: Francis Bowen, "Darwin on the Origin of Species," North American Review, XC (April, 1860), 474-506;

It is not necessary here to appraise the validity of the arguments which these churchmen made against Darwinism. The scientific nature of these has long since been either substantiated, proven false, or dismissed as irrelevant to the main thesis. But it is important to note that the theologians in this early period, with almost universal acclaim, rejected all the scientific claims for Darwinism and exaggeratedly emphasized the importance of every legitimate argument which was raised against it. They were soundly convinced that Darwinism was as unscientific in its foundations as any of the former evolutionary theories. The usual chevaux de bataille upon which they rode forth against Darwinism were: the lack of proof that species had actually evolved; the failure of the geological record to produce the fossils of the missing links; the sterility of hybrids; the failure of man-made varieties to survive in a state of nature; and the more rational explanation of the phenomena of nature which they believed their own special theory of creation and divine intervention furnished.³

Rev. D. R. Goodwin, D.D., "Darwin on the Origin of Species," American Theological Review, II (May, 1860), 326-44; Louis Agassiz, "Professor Agassiz on the Origin of Species," American Journal of Science and Arts, n.s., XXX (July, 1860), 142-54; Prof. W. C. Wilson, "Darwin on the Origin of Species," Methodist Quarterly Review, XLIII (October, 1861), 605-25; Herman Lincoln, D.D., "Development Versus Creation," Baptist Quarterly, II (July, 1868), 257-74; John A. Lowell, "Darwin on the Origin of Species," Christian Examiner, LXVIII (May, 1860), 449-64.

³All the men who have been cited in the complete study have developed one or more of these arguments in addition to others which they considered pertinent. Summaries of these counts against Darwinism were sometimes furnished for the busy reader. See, George Frederick Wright, "Recent Works Bearing on the Relation of Science to Religion," Bibliotheca Sacra, XXXIII (October, 1876), 656-94; James McCosh, The Development Hypothesis: Is It Sufficient? (New York, 1876), pp. 13-19. The scientific attacks were continued into the second decade of the controversy by very able writers and by less able men even to the close of the century. For representative attacks made on the scientific basis, see: "Darwinianism," American Quarterly Church Review, XXI (January, 1870), 524-36; Prof. Frederick Gardiner, D.D., "Darwinism," Bibliotheca Sacra, XXIX (April, 1872), 40-89.

Although the major emphasis of the early attacks on Darwinism centered around the attempt to discredit it as a scientific dogma, there loomed up from the first the terrible theological portents of the theory. Copernicus and his followers had dealt, scientifically, a death blow to the old celestial geography. But the church had not discarded her dubious dogmas built upon the framework of the old system. Driven somewhat from the dogma of a supernaturally controlled celestial universe, the religious doctors had taken refuge in the organic kingdom as a sort of last bulwark against the mechanizing influence of science. Into this cosmological superstructure an epic story of man had been woven. The divine attention bestowed upon his creation and redemption flattered both man and his abode. Darwinism was sensed as a threat to the very foundations of this superstructure. To remove the miraculously creating and intervening Deity from the world and to rob man of his unique place in nature, meant that the whole theological house would come tumbling down about the theologians' ears.

In spite of these well grounded fears the early American critics did not charge that Darwin had openly attempted to establish atheism. He was accused of ignoring or scoffing at the traditional proofs in the doctrine of design. Darwin's references to the Creator were called mere "complimentary allusions" to a Deity that was only filling "some honorary office rather than performing any efficient function in the universe." Others claimed that the doctrine of atheism was implicit in the theory whether Darwin expressly attacked theism or not.⁴ The veiled insinuations

⁴These insinuations may be found in the writings of the following critics: Francis Bowen, loc. cit., p. 475; John A. Lowell, loc. cit., pp. 449, 457; D. R. Goodwin, loc. cit., pp. 326-27; "The Antiquity of Man," American Presbyterian and Theological Review, n.s., II (April, 1864), 259; Rev. J. P. Thompson,

of atheism that were directed toward Darwin in the sixties became open charges of a deliberate purpose to establish atheism in the seventies. Evolution was considered as a crusade of infidelity under the guise of science. The evolutionists were described as delighting in the ungoding of the universe and satisfied with any terminology for the forces of nature but the name of God.⁵ Even though there were evolutionists who professed that the theory left God undisturbed, this attenuated conception of deity was looked upon as a useless remnant compared to the old biblical Jehovah.⁶ The fear for the Bible and the Christian dogmas was greatly increased with the definite inclusion of man in the process of evolution with the publication of the Descent of Man in 1871. Nothing could have been more humiliating to man than the lowly ancestry which Darwin assigned to him. The theologians endeavored to make the theory as revolting as possible. They presented it in the most cold-blooded and disgusting terminology that their rhetorical abilities could create. Peevish editors complained that Darwin might have adopted the title of "ascent of man" as a concession to the "injured pride of many of his readers."⁷ Al-

"Does Science Tend to Materialism?" New Englander, XIX (January, 1861), 87-88; Edward Hitchcock, D.D., "The Law of Nature's Constancy Subordinate to the Law of Change," Bibliotheca Sacra, XX (July, 1863), 522.

⁵"Darwinianism," American Quarterly Church Review, XXI (January, 1870), 524; Rev. E. Nisbet, "Darwinism," Baptist Quarterly, VII (January, 1873), 73; Francis L. Patton, Address at the Induction of Francis L. Patton into the Cyrus H. McCormick Professorship of Didactic and Polemic Theology in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the North West (Oct. 3, 1873), p. 29; Rev. Enoch F. Burr, Pater Mundi; Or, Doctrine of Evolution (Boston, 1873), p. 14; Dr. Charles Hodge, What Is Darwinism? (New York, 1874), pp. 44-45, 145, 147, 149.

⁶Rev. George B. Cheever, "An Attack on Darwinism," New York Tribune, May 4, 1874, p. 4; Tayler Lewis, "Evolution," New York Tribune, Jan. 22, 1876, p. 5 (an open letter).

⁷Prof. J. S. Stahr, "Theories of Evolution and Theology," Mercersburg Review, XIX (July, 1872), 448; George B. Cheever,

though there was the possibility of theology's being routed from the citadel of man's physical creation, a concession which they by no means granted at first, most theologians felt perfectly secure in the spiritual realm of man's being. Here were virtues which put man into a distinct kingdom. The theologians were convinced that these virtues could not be developed by the evolutionary process.⁸

The literal statement of the Bible was a bulwark of defense against the claims of the Darwinians. Its explicit description of the creation of Adam and Eve was considered an undeniable refutation of Darwinism by the biblical literalists. To disturb this Adamic origin of man was considered a threat at the very corner-stone of biblical truths.⁹ The problem was far more fundamental than the surrender of a familiar interpretation of Genesis. The truth of the whole Christian system and numerous doctrines were made to hinge on this literal interpretation of the Mosaic record. These dogmas involved the traditional conception of man, his fall, the nature of sin, and the plan of redemption. The alarm among the defenders of Christianity reached its zenith when they contemplated the effect of Darwinism upon their cherished beliefs.¹⁰ If "unadulterated Darwinism," it was said, were established and its truths percolated through to the masses, it would

loc. cit.; G.E.E., "Darwin's Descent of Man," Monthly Religious Magazine, XLV (May, 1871), 501.

⁸"The Origin of Man," Christian Examiner, LXXX (January, 1866), 60-64; John Bascom, "Darwin's Theory of the Origin of Species," American Presbyterian Review, n.s., III (July, 1871), 373; James McCosh, The Development Hypothesis, pp. 89-90.

⁹Taylor Lewis, loc. cit.; Minor Raymond (Garrett Biblical Institute), Systematic Theology (New York, 1877), II, 15.

¹⁰John T. Duffield, "Evolution Respecting Man and the Bible," Princeton Review, n.s., I (January, 1878), 160. "The hitch is not in the first chapter of Genesis," said Prof. Francis L. Patton, "so much as with Paul and the New Testament in general" (Interior, Dec. 30, 1875, p. 4).

mean not only the inevitable doom of Christianity but "every vestige of foundation for any religion would be swept away." When that day came, warned the Reverend I. N. Tarbox, "the occupation of preachers of the gospel and of religious newspapers will be gone."¹¹ Dogma after dogma was hurled at the scientific theory. The doctrines of immortality, incarnation, and the resurrection were declared to furnish undeniable evidence of God's immediate agency and his divine intervention.¹²

The seventies witnessed the most intense phase of the evolutionary struggle. Certain elements which came flocking into the evolutionary ranks alarmed and irritated the religious forces more than did Darwin himself. The churchmen saw all the "shallow and blatant opposers of Christianity" as champions of the new theory. These champions were considered as half-baked sciolists rather than scientists, who were bent on the destruction of Christianity as much as the exaltation of science.¹³ Besides the indiscriminate camp followers of evolution, there were certain provocative defenders of Darwinism, such as Buchner, Haeckel, Tynccall, and Spencer, who drew the fire of theological wrath.¹⁴ Three of

¹¹Rev. Increase N. Tarbox, "Darwinism and Christianity," Congregationalist, June 13, 1872, p. 185. Tarbox received a D.D. from Yale in 1869. He was a former editor of the Congregationalist.

¹²Ebenezer Dodge, D.D. [President of Madison University], The Evidences of Christianity, With an Introduction on the Existence of God and the Immortality of the Soul (Boston, 1869), p. 133; Samson Talbot [President of Denison University], "Development and Human Descent," Baptist Quarterly, VI (April, 1872), 139-40.

¹³Rev. J. B. Tyler, "Evolution in Natural History as Related to Christianity," New Englander, XXX (July, 1873), 465; Prof. Daniel S. Martin, The Relation of Christian Education to Modern Phases of Science, pp. 4-5 (an address delivered before the University convocation at Albany, N. Y., July 29-31, 1873).

¹⁴For typical criticisms of the addresses delivered at the banquet in honor of Tyndall before he sailed for England in February, 1873, see: the Christian Intelligencer, Feb. 13, 1873; the New York Evangelist, Feb. 13, 1873, p. 1; the Presbyterian, Aug. 2, 1873, p. 4. For attacks on Buchner, see: New York Christian

these men made visits to this country in the seventies. Spencer did not come till 1882 and Haeckel did not come at all. The most important of these visits as far as the evolutionary controversy was concerned was that of Huxley in 1876. While in this country Professor Huxley was prevailed on to deliver three lectures in New York upon the evidence of evolution. The announcement of these lectures created considerable anxiety on the part of the theologians as to the nature of the evidence which Huxley might produce. It seems that religious leaders were fearful that he might have some esoteric proof which would apply the coup de grace to the theological camp. Mr. Huxley calmly and logically traced the proof for evolution which had been worked out up to that time, basing his main arguments upon the evolution of the horse which Professor Marsh of Yale had dug out of the western plains.¹⁵ Immediately following the lectures there was a sigh of relief which went up from the theological camp. Instead of some new and miraculous demonstration of evolution, they were faced with the old arguments which they had been mauling around for fifteen years. Shouts of glee and denunciation came from all sides. The New York Observer whose caustic editorials from the pen of Irenaeus Prime galled many a sore-pressed evolutionist, set the pace by the acerbity of its sarcasm in dismissing Huxley's legendary proof of evolution. "It was a wretched fiasco" after the "great flourish of trumpets" which had announced Mr. Huxley. They were perfectly

Advocate, XLVIII (July 10, 1873), 220; Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review, n.s., I (October, 1872), 799-800; Bibliotheca Sacra, XXVI (January, 1869), 192. Tyndall's address at Belfast, Ireland, in August, 1874, stirred up more controversy than any other single address from the other side of the Atlantic. The weeklies, monthlies, and quarterlies were full of bitter denunciation and criticism of Tyndall for months.

¹⁵Huxley's lectures were published in full in the New York World, Herald, and Tribune, September 19, 21, 23, 1876. Marsh's account of the evolution of the horse had been published in the New York Tribune, May 4, 1874, p. 4.

familiar with all his vaunted proof. His horses were "old horses." If this were evolution from its "greatest apostle," then, they were grateful for his "coming over the sea to demonstrate to the "western barbarians" that there was "nothing in it."¹⁶ Huxley's lectures furnished good editorial and pulpit material for years.

The theologians were constantly seeking allies in their struggle against evolution. Every critic of Darwinism, scientific or pseudo-scientific, was capitalized by the churchmen and exploited to prove that the real leaders of science were opposed to Darwin's theory and that only the crowd of blatant sciolists were supporting him. There were many superficial and dogmatic attacks on Darwinism during this decade that professed the air of great learning and logic. These inane attacks appear superficial even in the light of the easily attainable knowledge of the seventies, but they were hailed as the final destruction of Darwinism.¹⁷

Skepticism in regard to the wisdom of the tactics which the ecclesiastical group had been following became rampant by the seventies. The seething discontent in regard to the futile efforts of the ministers to berate and ridicule Mr. Darwin off the stage by an assault of rhetoric and ill temper became articulate by 1873. Severe criticism of ministerial tactics was directed

¹⁶Editorial in the New York Observer, LIV (Sept. 28, 1876), 306. Other contemporary criticisms of Huxley may be found in the following: Rev. James M. Ludlow, D.D., Sermon before the Collegiate Church at 6th Ave. and 48th St., New York, New York Tribune, Oct. 2, 1876, p. 3; Herald and Presbyter, XXXVI (Oct. 4, 1876), 4; Interior, VII (Oct. 5, 1876), 5. In fact one can find these criticisms in nearly every religious journal of this period.

¹⁷An asset which the theologians valued very highly was Agassiz's posthumous essay, "Evolution and Permanence of Type," Atlantic Monthly, XXXIII (January, 1874), 92-101. They also drew comfort from St. George Mivart's Genesis of Species (New York, 1871). Among those of questionable scientific ability who were welcomed to the ranks of the anti-evolutionists were: J.G. Southall, The Recent Origin of Man (Philadelphia, 1875); Joseph Cook, Boston Monday Lectures, Biology With Preludes on Current Events (Boston, 1877).

toward the theologians by members of their own profession as well as by laymen. These were followed by milder criticisms and warnings by the more liberal members among the orthodox churchmen.¹⁸ The Independent and the Nation added their voice to those already raised by bitterly condemning the ministerial attacks on evolution which resulted from the theological explosion following Huxley's visit.¹⁹ These controversies within the ranks of the religious leaders somewhat cleared the air, compelled a review of the strategy used thus far in the struggle, and led to the acceptance of a more compromising attitude.

THE EARLY COMPROMISES WITH EVOLUTION

A few liberals in the seventies accepted evolution and proceeded to adjust Christianity to it.²⁰ But the moderate elements among the orthodox sects could not go so far in their ac-

¹⁸Dr. Augustus Blauvelt [Minister of the Dutch Reformed Church], "Modern Skepticism," Scribners Monthly, VI (August, September, October, 1873), 424-32, 582-96, 725-39; Prof. L. E. Hicks [of Denison University], "Scientists and Theologians--How They Disagree and Why," Baptist Quarterly, VIII (July, 1874), 251-69; IX (January, July, 1875), 48-75, 281-305; Rev. Charles F. Deems, D.D., "Science and Religion," Popular Science Monthly, VIII (February, 1876), 434-49; Phillips Brooks, Lectures on Preaching (New York, 1880), pp. 228-29 (lectures delivered in 1877 at Yale University).

¹⁹*Some Thoughts on Evolution," Independent, XXVIII (Sept. 21, 1876), 16; "Clergymen as Scientific Men," Nation, XXIII (October, 1876), 252-53.

²⁰Minot J. Savage, The Religion of Evolution (Boston, 1876). Savage claimed to have been the first pastor, who, in the regular course of his pulpit ministrations, accepted evolution fully and attempted to adjust religion to it. He was pastor of the Church of the Unity in Boston. James T. Bixby, Professor at Meadville Seminary and later pastor at Yonkers, New York, published Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge (New York, 1876); Rev. S. R. Calthrop, "Religion and Evolution," Religious Magazine and Monthly Review, I (September, 1873), 193-213 (an address before a Unitarian conference in Boston in April and May, 1873); "Religion and Science," Unitarian Review and Religious Magazine, II (November, 1874), 309-35. The three cited above were members of the Unitarian faith.

ceptance of evolution. Increasingly the conviction was dawning among them that Darwinism was the direction in which science was moving. The resiliency with which the church had survived so many past controversies and with which she had adapted dogmas to so many new philosophies again came to her aid. Evolution, upon a re-examination, it was discovered, was not so mechanical or godless as they had thought. There were vital factors which must be accounted for, whether you accept evolution or the theory of immediate creation. This element would not accept evolution as true or demonstrated, but declared that even if evolution were true, it still did not follow that the theory was necessarily atheistic. The old mechanical theory of evolution was modified and a new definition was proposed, which many of the theologians professed to accept. The essential and obvious factors of the two old beliefs, the superintending Deity on the one hand and the evolutionary process of growth on the other, were blended into a new cosmic Providence. We admit evolution and believe it, they said, that is, an evolution "originated by a divine Creator, guided by a divine intelligence, and governed by a divine purpose."²¹

The Darwinian theory at first had seemed to be a death blow to all argument for design in nature. But the belief in a benevolent Providence was too deeply ingrained in the mind of the Christian world for this blow at teleology to prove fatal. A new approach to the problem of design was discovered. The whole sweep of evolutionary creation, the orderly principle of law, and the

²¹Prof. Wm. N. Rice, "The Darwinian Theory of the Origin of Species," New Englander, XXVI (October, 1867), 603-35; Rev. J. B. Tyler, "Evolution and Natural History as Related to Christianity," ibid., XXX (July, 1871), 465; Prof. Frederick Gardiner, D.D. [of Berkeley Divinity School], "The Bearing of Recent Scientific Thought upon Theology," Bibliotheca Sacra, XXXV (January, 1878), 66-67; Rev. George F. Wright, "Recent Works Bearing on the Relation of Science to Religion," ibid., XXXIV (April, 1877), 366.

steady process of development were declared to imply and necessitate the principle of design as much as the old fiat creation had ever done. The old carpenter theory of design with its anthropomorphic conception of the designer was discarded. The progress of evolution had wiped out the separate and individual designs and had given in their place, "one infinite, all embracing design, stretching across infinite space and infinite time, which includes and predetermines and absorbs every possible separate design."²²

The early alarmists who had predicted the destruction of Christianity if evolution ever came to prevail, were repudiated by the compromising elements in the mid-seventies. Andrew P. Peabody of Harvard voiced the opinion of one element when he declared in his Ely lectures in 1874 that a conflict between Christianity and science was impossible. True science and Christianity had come from the same source and they could not by any possibility contradict each other. They must coincide when they cover the same points. God must have put his signature on nature as he had on the written word. "The hieroglyphics of nature must needs correspond to the alphabetic writing of revelation," Peabody continued, "which may interpret and supplement, but cannot supercede or falsify them."²³ Another group reaffirmed the old idea of the duality of truth, declaring that Christianity and science, resting on different foundations, dealing with different subject matter and appealing to different faculties of the mind, had nothing to

²²Asa Gray had contended from the first that Darwinism did not destroy design ("Natural Selection Not Inconsistent with Natural Theology," Atlantic Monthly, July, August, and October, 1860). John Fiske denied the old design but championed the new view (Cosmic Philosophy [New York, 1878], II, 466). James McCosh, Development Hypothesis, pp. 45-47. Joseph Le Conte, "Evolution in Relation to Materialism," Princeton Review, n.s., VII (March, 1881), 162, 165.

²³Andrew P. Peabody, Christianity and Science (New York, 1874), pp. 2-5.

do with each other.²⁴ But this compromise was not satisfactory to either orthodox or liberal.

Considerable mental gymnastics were employed in the exegetical efforts to adjust the Bible to the new theory without accepting evolution. One group took the position that the Bible was the scientific norm, the Ultima Thule, to which all science in the end must conform. Another element, taking its cue from the allegorical apologetics of the geological controversy, searched the Scriptures to see if it could not find in them the anticipations of the evolutionary hypothesis. These apologists ignored completely the historical setting of these writings and the cosmology and science in vogue at the time they were written down. The Genesis story was distorted and its language forced to proclaim, in general if not in detail, the marvelous revelations of modern evolution four thousand years before Darwin's time.²⁵

A far more serious problem than the harmony of the Scriptures and Christianity in general with the Darwinian theory was the question of the evolution of man. The including of him in the process had caused the greatest alarm among the defenders of traditional theology. It was but natural that this sector of the theological front would be the most tenaciously defended and the

²⁴John A. Broadus, "Science and Religion," Sermons and Addresses (Baltimore, 1886), pp. 348-50 (an address delivered in honor of J. Lawrence Smith in 1879); Rev. E. O. Havens, "Evolution Admitted, What Then?" Independent, XXXII (May 6, 1880), 2.

²⁵"Services of Science," Standard, XV (Aug. 13, 1868), 4 (is a good illustration of the belief that the Bible was the scientific norm). James McCosh advocated the theory that Genesis anticipated the evolutionary theory (Development Hypothesis . . . , pp. 54-58, 94-95). Arnold Guyot, Professor of Geology at Princeton, lectured along this line for years. He published his ideas in book form in 1884 under the title, Creation; or, The Biblical Cosmogony In The Light of Modern Science (New York). Tayler Lewis' Six Days of Creation (Schenectady, N. Y.) was republished in 1878 and hailed as the wonder of the age. Newman Smyth waxed eloquent in his repudiation of the "carpenter-like theory" of creation in his Old Faiths in New Light (New York, 1891), pp. 170-72.

most reluctantly surrendered. The theologians were several years slower in yielding to a compromise on the creation of man than they were in yielding on the general question of the atheism and infidelity of evolution. This delay was caused by the literalism with which they accepted the explicit biblical statements in regard to man's creation.²⁶

The intransigent literalist would not yield an iota, even on the creation of Adam's body. But a more amenable group would grant the possibility of the evolution of the body, as the Bible had not expressly described the process of forming Adam from "the dust." The bodies of beasts, ultimately disintegrating into dust, could have been implied by the inspired phrase, "the dust of the ground." By this interpretation the Creator could have taken the body of some former animal and remodeled it with a human frame and then by an immediate and direct act engrafted onto it the new human spirit. This theory would still leave room for the immediate creation of man and in no wise undermine the dogmas built on this doctrine.²⁷

This mild group of hesitating compromisers was soon outstripped in the early eighties by a group of enthusiastic evolu-

²⁶Evidence of this literal acceptance of the creation story of man is found in all types of theological literature. A good example of the catechistic drills for young theologians, A. A. Hodge, Outline of Theology (New York, 1882), p. 296. A picturesque sermon use of it was made by Phillips Brooks, Mystery of Iniquity and Other Sermons (Sermons 6th Series) (New York, 1897), p. 246. A very literal creedal statement of it was made by the Southern Presbyterians (Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States [New York, 1886], p. 18).

²⁷Rev. J. M. Manning, Half Truths and the Truth (Boston, 1873), p. 21. According to Alexander Winchell, Adam was the progenitor of the white race only, the black and brown races he believed had been in existence for centuries before Adam. See, Pre-Adamites; or, a Demonstration of the Existence of Men Before Adam (Chicago). Winchell's book was formally published in 1881, although he had been advocating the theory for several years. The Independent agreed with Winchell's view ("Christian Evolution," Independent, XXXII [Jan. 8, 1880], 12).

tionists, lay and clerical, who had been captivated by the Spenserian optimism. These men accepted a theistic conception of evolution and believed it was to usher in a new day in theology as well as in science. It was going to unlock all the riddles of nature and make logical and plain the theological and spiritual secrets, which had been hidden from the foundation of the world. The old religious truths were to be placed on a scientific basis and thus made unanswerable. Among the most important leaders in this movement were: Henry Ward Beecher and his cohort, Lyman Abbott; Theodore T. Munger and Newman Smyth of New Haven; Minot J. Savage; Henry Drummond; John Fiske; Edward L. Youmans; and Joseph Le Conte.

New meaning gleaned from evolutionary truth was poured into the concept of God. A more infinite intelligence loomed before them as they contemplated the ceaseless unfolding purposes of nature. Under the old conception, causative will had determined effects by separate acts, which in themselves being finite, revealed a finite will. "But a will which by one eternal act determines the evolution and sustentation of an infinite cosmos must itself be infinite," was Professor Le Conte's logic for his enlarged conception of the Deity.²⁸

The process of revealing this divine personality was also made to conform to the laws of evolution. In place of the occasional heavenly visions, revelation became a "continuous process adjusted to the developing reason of man." The divine truth had welled up from within man's spirit. It had not dropped in from above.²⁹ Christianity itself could claim no immunity from the

²⁸Joseph Le Conte, "Evolution in Relation to Materialism," Princeton Review, n.s., VII (March, 1881), 161-62; John Fiske, Darwinism and Other Essays (New York, 1893), pp. 6-7; Rev. J. M. Whiton, "Darwin and Darwinism," New Englander, XLII (January, 1883), 62-63; Rev. T. T. Munger, "Evolution and the Faith," Century, X (May, 1886), 110.

²⁹Francis Johnson, "Co-operative Evolution," Andover Re-

general process of evolution. Lyman Abbott endeavored to show that the law of progress was the same in the "spiritual realm" as it was in the "physical realm." Using Professor Le Conte's definition of evolution as "continuous progressive change, according to certain laws and by means of resident forces," Dr. Abbott found that this agreed with religion defined as "the life of God in the soul of man."³⁰

The doctrine of sin and the dogma of the fall of man took on new meaning from the evolutionary experience of the race. Sin was no longer merely the rebellion against the arbitrary will of God. It was the "conflict between the lower elements of human nature and the higher." Sin was a left over bit of the "ape and tiger," still lurking in man. It no longer sprang from a corrupted nature but from a nature not yet "unfolded nor harmoniously developed."³¹ To the optimistic theologians of the eighties evolution was no fatal blow at the cherished doctrine of immortality. One group found positive proof for immortality in the operation of certain principles which had been operating to bring life to its present stage. These principles, they believed, must continue to operate in the higher process of life. Another group found

view, III (May, 1885), 438; Newman Smyth, Through Science to Faith (new ed., New York, 1904), pp. 27, 38-39, 47; M. J. Savage, The Irrepressible Conflict Between Two World Theories (Boston, 1892), 28; Lyman Abbott, Evolution of Christianity (New York, 1892), 66.

³⁰Lyman Abbott, op. cit., pp. iv-v, 1, 7-10, 25. Beecher made a strong statement of the effect evolution was going to have on Christianity in his "Progress of Thought in the Church," North American Review, CXXXV (August, 1882), 110.

³¹Henry Ward Beecher, "The Sinfulness of Man," Evolution and Religion (New York, 1886), I, 84 (sermon preached on June 14, 1885); John Fiske, Destiny of Man Viewed in the Light of his Origin (New York, 1884), p. 103; F. H. Johnson, "Theistic Evolution," Andover Review, I (April, 1884), 378-79; T. T. Munger, Appeal to Life (New York, 1891), p. 231.

analogous relations between the scientific dogmas and the Christian hope, which made the old dream of immortality seem more reasonable than ever before.³²

The evolutionary optimists were not satisfied with the half-way compromises of the biblical literalists in regard to the creation of man. They scoffed at the idea that all the "brute inherited faculties and experiences" could be blotted out in the twinkling of an eye and a new human soul poured into the spiritual vacuum. They went out to capture the whole man for evolution. Body and soul, they saw him sucked into the process of nature, until he stood forth as much a child of nature as a son of God. His dignity was not in the least affronted. The opposition to the Darwinian origin was declared to be "sentimental" rather than "rational." The monkey ancestry was held to be no more humiliating than the mud man theory. In fact they began to prefer Darwin's "heroic little monkey" to the theologian's "clay-cold figure."³³ They believed that the process of physical evolution of man had apparently come to an end. It had finished its task. Henceforth the creative processes of the universe would be concentrated on the moral and spiritual improvement of man until this particular species would be "indefinitely perfected and raised to a totally different plane than that on which all life had hitherto existed." The evolutionary processes, it was thought, were automatically

³²Le Conte, "Man's Place in Nature," Princeton Review, n.s., II (November, 1878), 794-96; Henry Drummond, Natural Law in the Spiritual World (41st ed., London, 1905), pp. 214-15; Smyth, Through Science to Faith, pp. 185-91; Munger, op. cit., p. 259.

³³F. H. Johnson, "Theistic Evolution," Andover Review, I (April, 1884), 377. Lyman Abbott related how he would answer the sneers concerning the monkey ancestry by replying, "I would as soon have a monkey as a mud man for my ancestor" ("Reminiscences," Outlook, CX [July 28, 1915], 749). T. T. Munger, op. cit., p. 226. Beecher was very enthusiastic for the new conception (loc. cit., p. 113).

and irresistibly evolving society into a utopian era and man into a state of moral perfection. Evolution was thus furnishing a glorious interpretation of Christian soteriology.³⁴

It was not all harmony within the religious camp in the eighties. There was a large group which resented the efforts of religious leaders to make Christianity conform to evolution. Bitter criticisms of Beecher poured from the conservative press and pulpit. His scientific knowledge and ability were ridiculed. Drummond was accused of leading Christianity back to materialism. He was called a traitor, the Benedict Arnold of theology.³⁵ Lesser leaders came in for a share of the blame. The ministers were accused of taking up evolution just as science was laying it aside. The ultra orthodox leaders capitalized any criticism of the Darwinian theory as a renunciation of the whole evolutionary philosophy. The New York Observer violently resented the Independent's charge that evolution was being taught in the colleges. The Presbyterian General Assembly in 1882 warned its theological teachers to avoid the dangerous heresy. The early demise of evolution was prophesied and evolutionists were appropriately warned of the punishment awaiting them in the world to come.³⁶

³⁴Fiske, The Destiny of Man, p. 30; T. T. Munger, "Man the Final Form in Creation," op. cit., p. 299 (a sermon); Beecher, Evolution and Religion, I, 76, 81.

³⁵Some of these criticisms may be found in the following: Congregationalist, XXXIV (July 26, 1882), 250; Advance, XVII (July 27, 1882), 480; Standard, XXXI (Dec. 27, 1883), 1; Interior, Nov. 27, 1884, p. 4.

³⁶Observer, Dec. 11, 1879, p. 394; Independent, Dec. 18, 1879, pp. 14-15, and in several issues following these.

THEOLOGY'S FINAL ADJUSTMENT

By the last decade of the nineteenth century science had fully made up its mind to accept evolution, at least as a working hypothesis. Although many of the intransigent theological opponents, as we have seen, did not see this, or refused to admit it, the real leaders of religious thought, especially in the North-east Section of the United States, admitted the triumph of evolution. There is a different tone in the proclamations and admissions of this triumph in the nineties from those made twenty years before. Those declarations of victory in the seventies took on the nature of prophecies rather than chronicles of established facts. But in the last decade the concessions were made after a generation had wrestled with the Darwinian hypothesis. It had stood the test and held its ground under one of the most bitter and searching assaults of modern times. In spite of this obstinate opposition the principles, originally applied in the organic field, had come to prevail in every branch of human study. Whether man was studying amoebas or stars, plants or human institutions, the scholars who were making the most profound impressions and the greatest contributions to knowledge, were those who had accepted the general principles of Darwinism and were applying them to the problems confronting them. That this was obvious to all perspicacious observers is evident from the frequent statements of candid thinkers that evolution had won. "The fingers on one hand," said Professor William North Rice in 1891, "will now more than suffice to count all anti-evolutionists who are competent to have an opinion on the subject."³⁷ The fact that one

³⁷"Twenty-five Years of Scientific Progress," Bibliotheca Sacra, L (January, 1893), 3 (a presidential address before the American Association of Naturalists, December, 1891).

might search in vain the current literature to find arguments endeavoring to prove the truth of evolution, was no sign of its being abandoned, as some churchmen assumed, said Professor Conn, but because it had been "so convincingly attested by thousands of lines of argument" that proof was thought no more necessary than proof of the theory of gravitation.³⁸ Reverend Theodore Munger, whose unruffled calm appears like a rock in much of this stormy period, recognizing the validity of the original controversy over Darwinism, for in that process truth had been established, saw that some form of evolution was so widely accepted by 1890, that it "no longer [stirred] offense and [awakened] suspicion to name it in connection with questions of theology." He rejected the stand of those who said that it would be soon enough to adjust theology to it when it "ceased to be a hypothesis and became a full established theory." "The link between hypothesis and theory is seldom defined," he said, "it is not a line but a region. There is much in the doctrine of evolution that is hypothetical as there is still in astronomy." It would be false to reject it because we can't verify it, because most of us, he thought, could not verify the Copernican theory, yet we accepted it on the faith of scientists. As for evolution, he judged, we had "sailed far enough in this voyage of search after the creative mind to warrant the belief that we [drew] nigh to the land of our quest."³⁹ While in 1890, Dr. Munger might considerably qualify the degree of proof which evolution had attained, Professor William Rupp at the end

³⁸Prof. H. W. Conn, Ph.D. (Wesleyan Univ., Middletown, Conn.), "The Three Great Epochs of World Evolution," Methodist Review, LXXVIII (November, 1896), 886. "The consensus of scientific and philosophical opinion is already well-nigh, if not wholly complete," was the status of evolution in the opinion of Joseph Le Conte (Evolution and Its Relation to Religious Thought [New York, 1889], 257).

³⁹Appeal to Life, pp. 211, 215-16.

of the century could write,

until recently it used to be said, with some degree of plausibility, that the theory of evolution was an unproved hypothesis. Theologians especially would rid themselves of its presence in this way, and go on formulating their doctrines concerning God and the universe without the least reference to its teachings. This is now no longer possible. Evolution is now as much an established theory of the universe as is the theory of gravitation or the planetary motion. . . .⁴⁰

So pronounced was the irenic era that had come to prevail in theological circles that the scientists took notice of it. "Now and then, indeed," said Professor Rice, "some theological Rip Van Winkle attempts the old Sinaitic thunders in denunciation of the essential atheism of evolution; but his utterances are regarded by his brethren in the church, not with sympathy, but with amusement or mortification."⁴¹ Even the hypercritic of orthodoxy, the Popular Science Monthly, had to admit in 1896, that on "several occasions lately," it had had "to note the glowing liberality of theological thought in relation to scientific questions."⁴² The scientists themselves had grown less materialistic. They had ceased to shout "paeans over the anticipated destruction of faith."⁴³ They were less evangelical in their fervor to erect the temple of worship to science and therefore were less irksome to the theological defenders. A search of the religious periodicals and newspapers which had carried the van of the attack against evolution in the seventies and eighties seldom reveals a reference to evolution in the nineties except in attempts to harmonize its teachings with religion or to minimize the idea of conflict, even when the

⁴⁰"The Evolution Theory in Theology," Reformed Church Review (4th ser.), VI (July, 1902), 384.

⁴¹Prof. Wm. N. Rice, loc. cit., pp. 27-28.

⁴²Popular Science Monthly, I (December, 1896), 267.

⁴³Prof. George McCloskie (Princeton College), "The Testimony of Nature," Presby. & Reformed Review, I (October, 1890), 595.

author was not convinced of the truth of evolution. Even the Homiletic Monthly under the editorship of D. G. Gregory, an inveterate foe of Darwinism, was remarkably discreet in its silence during the latter years of this last decade. With the exception of the southern and western publications, the violent opposition to evolution expressed during the last decade of the nineteenth century is mainly found in apologetical and polemical material published in book or pamphlet form. The Independent in February, 1893, conducted a symposium on "religion and science."⁴⁴ Under no consideration could the contributors to this symposium, with the possible exception of Professor Bowne, be classed with the radical or liberal religious leaders. Yet without a single exception they declared that there was no conflict between science and religion. Any conflict which did exist, said Professor Bowne, was not between science and religion, but between "scientists and religionists" and the "root" of this was "ignorance," resulting from the unpleasant condition produced by what he called the "magazine scientist" and the "panicky Christian."⁴⁵ There was nothing new in any of the thought which this symposium produced. The significant thing about the discussion lay in the fact that one of the contributors, Professor Bowne, had been the portrayer some fifteen years before of the black despair which evolution brought in its philosophical train and now he could say that there was no reason to be alarmed over evolution for it was false metaphysics which had given it "irreligious significance." Professor Packard, another contributor, had also been careful thirteen years before

⁴⁴The contributors were Bishop H. W. Warren, University Park, Colorado; Borden P. Bowne of Boston University; Talbot W. Chambers; and Prof. A. S. Packard, the latter from Brown University (Independent, XLV [Feb. 2, 1893], 1-4).

⁴⁵Borden P. Bowne, Philosophy of Theism (New York, 1887), pp. 1-2.

to profess no close relationship with evolution. Now he could say, "There is a growing appreciation of the fact that evolution is but a mode of working of a power superior to and outside the universe, though yet indwelling in it" ⁴⁶ More indicative of the changed attitude was the reaction of the religious mind to Professor Drummond's addresses on evolution and religion before the Chautauqua Assembly in July, 1893. In a search through all the major religious weeklies only one criticism, and that an indirect one, was found of Professor Drummond's addresses and this one appeared two years after the addresses were delivered. ⁴⁷ There may have been other protests which the writer was unable to locate but if it had been a few years before one would not have had to search for the protests. They would have screamed from every issue for such brazen effrontery on the part of the evolutionary crowd. It was significant that Professor Drummond, with his thoroughgoing adherence to Darwinism, was asked to speak before the Chautauqua Assembly, whose managers had been careful to provide an intellectual pabulum against which the most "sensitive prejudice need not revolt." Here at Chautauqua was accustomed to

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷The lectures were given a sort of question and answer treatment by the Christian Advocate. "Q. Can the doctrine taught by Professor Henry Drummond in the first of the course of lectures, entitled, 'The evolution of the animal body of man,' delivered before the Chautauqua Assembly, July 2, 1893, be harmonized with the Bible account of creation of man? A. Certainly not with the account taken literally, nor does it make any difference. What is the use of trying to harmonize with the Bible the individual notions of one man like Professor Drummond. Q. If it cannot be so harmonized, then is it proper for the Chautauqua Assembly to lend its wonderful facilities to the propagation of such error? A. Dr. Drummond is a professed Christian of considerable reputation. On the strength of his general fame he was, with propriety invited to lecture at Chautauqua. These lectures on evolution surprised many of his most ardent admirers; but the subject is recondite; few are competent to think or reason upon it. Christianity can be trusted to take care of itself against any course of lectures" (May 9, 1895, p. 293).

gather the average, middle-class, religious type, coming from the regions not profoundly stirred by modern thought. "When, therefore, Chautauqua managers provide lectures in defense of evolution," said the Nation, "and Chautauqua audiences gather to hear them with much pious edification and strengthening in their faith, it is a sign of the times which no observer can neglect."⁴⁸

The above description is only the negative side of the theological adjustment to evolution. There was a group of profound and tolerant minds scattered through the different denominations who re-thought much of the enthusiastic philosophy which had so forcibly gripped the accepters of evolution in the eighties. These men possessed a more sober and balanced judgment than the leaders of the former decade had displayed. They held a saner, and therefore a more profound attitude toward the part that evolution was going to play in human affairs. Their matured scholarship grasped and used more intelligently the historical method, the most important by-product that had come in the wake of evolution. Its application to the whole wide range of investigation necessitated a restatement of religious truths and dogmas in the light of this newer conception of evolution. After this sober, second judgment the theologians must decide what effect after all evolution was to have on such questions as the creative power of God, the mode and nature of God's revelation to man, the place of man in nature, the problem of sin, the moral nature of man and the process of his redemption. There are a number of men whose contributions to the solution of these problems are worthy of mention, or, who at least were more articulate on this subject than any of their contemporaries. William Newton Clarke of Colgate University, with his gentle spirit and lucid mind, exerted a far-

⁴⁸Editorial in the Nation, LVII (July 13, 1893), 21.

reaching influence that transcended the confines of his own Baptist denomination.⁴⁹ Henry Churchill King, professor and president at Oberlin College, with his liberal attitude toward evolution, was offsetting the rather conservative teachings in that institution of his colleague, George Frederick Wright, and at the same time was influencing a large host beyond the Congregational fold. President King was ably assisted in his denomination by the pulpiteer, T. T. Munger and the teaching of Professor George Harris of Andover, especially in the field of evolutionary ethics. Dr. Lyman Abbott cannot be overlooked in a consideration of this group but mentally he seems closer to the enthusiastic fervor and atmosphere of the eighties. Among the Presbyterians young William Adams Brown was rising to fame at the Union Theological Seminary where he began to teach in 1893. Although his important books did not appear until after the turn of the century, he was instructing young theologians along these lines in the nineties. At the University of Chicago William R. Harper and George B. Foster were exercising a wide influence among biblical and theological scholars.⁵⁰ President Harper was not primarily concerned in the direct problem of evolution. His main energy was directed to the application of the by-product, historical and literary

⁴⁹Writing of him at the time of his death, Shailer Matthews spoke of him as "the most interesting and possibly the most typical of that little group of men who have enabled so many protestant clergymen of America and Great Britain to pass from the older to the newer point of view in evangelical theology" ("In Memoriam, William Newton Clarke," American Journal of Theology, XVI [July, 1912], 444). In speaking of Clarke's Outline of Christian Theology, the Outlook said, "This was an epoch making book, for it was the first broad survey of Christian theology which frankly accepted the modern view of the world" (Jan. 27, 1912).

⁵⁰Foster was one of the ablest and most influential theological writers of his time in America. Tolerant by nature, well-read in philosophy, thoroughly conversant with European biblical scholarship, he was a powerful force toward the liberalizing of orthodox Christianity" (Dictionary of American Biography, VI, 548).

criticism, to the study of the Bible. A survey of the first eight years of the Biblical World, which he edited, reveals only one or two articles which could be said to deal directly with evolution as a problem for religion. It had ceased to be a problem to him. George B. Foster's the Finality of the Christian Religion, which appeared in 1906, handled the problem of evolution and religion, not as a current one but one which had been solved. In addition to these men who have been mentioned there was a more conservative group which could not go so far in accepting evolution as the first group. These men were possessed of broad scholarship and were tolerant of evolution as long as it remained in what they considered its proper sphere. Dr. Augustus H. Strong, President of Rochester Theological Seminary was typical of the men who would yield to a form of evolution but at the same time save most of the dogmas of religion by a harmony more profound than that offered by the Biblicalists of the late seventies and more conservative than the extravagant identifications of evolution and Christianity proposed by the enthusiastic apologists of the eighties. Within this latter group, or possibly in a class by himself, would fall Professor Bowne, whom we have seen as a bitter foe of the materialistic philosophy which he saw coming in the wake of evolution. In the nineties he strongly repudiated the logical basis for any metaphysical claims evolution might profess. Philosophically evolution, when rightly interpreted was harmless. It left metaphysics, as so many of his contemporaries were saying it left religion and its doctrines, right where it found it.⁵¹

⁵¹Bowne is given great credit for the service he rendered his fellow Methodists in clearing away some of the obstructions to modern thinking. Although conservative on some questions such as evolution and Christology he was accused of heresy in 1909 but was acquitted. See, D.A.B., II, 523 and American Journal of Theology, July, 1910. The list of names given above by no means exhausts the names of those influential in the evolutionary controversy but the author believes that the ones mentioned were the most influential among the evangelical bodies.

These theologians found no conflict between their conception of the activities of Deity and the cosmic processes advocated by the evolutionists. The harmony which they saw between the two conceptions was not radically different from that already worked out in the eighties except that they do not seem to be quite so concerned whether their old concepts of Deity are completely identified with the evolutionary process. They are more willing to remand evolution proper to the scientists and are less energetic about remolding it into a defender of the older theological thought patterns. When the older concepts of deity were seen as the growth from former philosophical difficulties, they did not feel the same divine urge to defend them as absolutely necessary to the Christian faith as former generations which looked on their views as absolute.⁵² The central key of emphasis in this new conception of Deity became God's immanence rather than his transcendence. While the evolutionists spoke of "resident forces in nature," the theologian talked of the immanent God.⁵³ There were some theologians who protested that although the theologians might be willing to identify these two powers as the same, the scientists would

⁵²Professor Schurman in his Winkley lectures at Andover in 1890 illustrated this point. He showed how the old apology for God's existence had been connected with a certain doctrine of creation, which had arisen in the conflict between Christianity and the Gnostics. To escape the Gnostic charge that the Christians advocated the old Hebrew duality, God and Chaos, the Christians adopted the miraculous creation of the world out of nothing. But the insistence upon this particular dogma of creation as essential to a belief in God had given the Agnostics of the nineteenth century an opportunity to undermine theology. When the Christian insisted on arguing from this remote creation to a belief in First Cause, Spencer had said that God was "Unknowable," since creation as described by the theologians was inconceivable (Jacob G. Schurman, Belief in God, Its Origin, Nature and Basis [New York, 1902 ed.], pp. 139-49).

⁵³Prof. Frank Hugh Foster, "Evolution and the Evangelical System of Doctrine," Bib. Sac., L (July, 1893), 413-14 (Inaugural address before taking the chair of Systematic Theology at the Pacific Theological Seminary, Oakland, Calif., Feb. 24, 1893. He formerly taught in Oberlin and later at Olivet College, Michigan).

not interpret the phrase "by means of resident forces," to mean that God was "pouring the energies of his Divine Will into created forms, and carrying them forward to further development."⁵⁴ But upon this very point theologians like Lyman Abbott took issue, on the grounds that not only the theologians but also the scientists were interpreting the "resident forces" to be none other than the ceaseless flow of divine energy in the world.⁵⁵ The continuous process revealed by evolution was declared to be a more rational and eloquent testimony of the manifestation of God than were the old miraculous interventions of Deity which filled in the supposed gaps in the process of nature. The latter method had become a dangerous type of apology for the proof of God's existence for one by one the gaps were being filled and God was being pushed step by step from the process of nature, if he were to be found only in the cataclysms and disorders of the world.⁵⁶ "For its own sake," Henry Churchill King said,

theology can remain satisfied no longer with the old, inconsistent view of a virtual independence of the world in the larger part of it, and of direct dependence on God at certain points only, where we cannot yet trace the process of God's working. It is quite unwilling to say that God is only where we cannot understand him. It is quite unwilling to admit that increasing knowledge of God's working is progressive elimination of God from the universe. It is quite unwilling to take its stand on gaps or base its argument for God on ignorance. It believes in God--in a God upon whom the whole universe, in every least atom of it, and in every humblest spirit of it, is absolutely dependent. Of that dependence it is certain, and no study of the method of it can make it less certain.⁵⁷

⁵⁴Rev. W. Douglas MacKenzie, D.D. (Professor at the University of Chicago), "Evolution Theories and Christian Doctrine," Bib. Sac., LIV (July, 1897), 549 (Address before the class of 1897 at Oberlin Sem.).

⁵⁵Lyman Abbott, Theology of an Evolutionist (New York, 1897), pp. 10-11.

⁵⁶Washington Gladden, "The New Evolution," McClures Magazine, III (August, 1894), 237.

⁵⁷"Reconstruction in Theology," American Journal of Theology, III (April, 1899), 308. These views were later printed in book form under the same title as the magazine article (N.Y.1901).

But it was a genuine theory of evolution which King would insist that the theologians accept from science, not a half-way conception which had caused trouble in the past. Theology was interested only in insisting that it be real evolution, that is a "succession of stages with new phenomena and new laws," including man as well as the animals. Theology rejected the idea of putting everything on a "dead level" or reducing everything to the "lowest level." Theology insisted "that when the new appeared it [was] really new." It might be assumed that the process of producing this "new" was gradual and that the "power was there ready to appear when the conditions for its appearance [were] completed," but when the new appeared, whether it be "life, self-consciousness or moral responsibility," it was really new. "It had not appeared before." When this view of evolution was maintained, which King believed consistent with the laws and definition of evolution, theology, he said, had "no religious or ideal considerations" hindering it from accepting

the most absolute and radical form of evolutionary theory without any thought of intervention at any point in the process. It feels no interest in insisting upon certain unbridged gaps in the series as essential at all to a religious view of the world. The most absolute evolutionary theory, so long as it is scientific at all, can be only a description of the process by which God has worked, of the method which he has employed.⁵⁸

To William Newton Clarke, God was "the source of the universe," whether you held the conception of the immediate production of it at some point in time or the view that his eternal existence "was always accompanied by a universe in some stage of being." Whatever the method of producing the universe may have been, it had no "independent existence" apart from God. Philosophically Professor Clarke believed it would be easier for the

⁵⁸Henry Churchill King, Reconstruction in Theology (New York, 1901), p. 308.

Christian to believe in the continuous creation than to "think of an instantaneous creation of all existing things when there had been nothing but God before." But between the two views theology was not compelled to decide as long as it could maintain that God was a free spirit, dwelling in the universe, and "active in the whole of it" but not wholly occupied by it or "exhausting his possibilities in conducting its processes." This view, he maintained, affirmed both the "immanence and the transcendence of God.* The method which God had used in building this universe was the evolutionary process, that is, "a gradual, progressive method, operating from within," which had always characterized his work in "creating, sustaining and ordering all." As long as we recognize God as a free spirit, greater than the Universe, the method decided "nothing as to his manner of originating it." As far as evolution was concerned, the universe may have been originated in time or it may have been co-eternal with God, for the question of origins lay back of the scope of evolution. "This evolutionary method," said Professor Clarke.

does not necessarily preclude acts of creation in the course of the general movement. A free spirit is not in bondage to his own methods. A method of growth does not rule out acts of implanting; conceivably it might imply them. Life, when its time came, may have come in by direct creation; so may human life, or the life of other species; or the whole process of unfolding may have been continuous, impelled by only one kind of divine movement from first to last. Whether God has performed special acts of creation from time to time is a question for evidence which lies outside of the field of theology. We are free to recognize acts if we find evidence that they have occurred, and equally free to dispense with them in our thoughts if evidence goes to the contrary. Theology is indifferent as to the result of the inquiry.

Likewise the whole question of miracles resolved itself into a question of evidence. Their possibility could not be denied except by "Atheism and Pantheism which made God unfree." But if miracles did occur, they would be rare, or else the uniformity of nature would be broken up and man's confidence in its order de-

stroyed.⁵⁹

The views of William Adams Brown were not far different from those of Professor Clarke and President King. He was more concerned with God's control of the universe than with his creation of it in some remote past. Still the doctrine of creation must be retained, for it was essential to the Christian conception of divine control. The questions concerned with the nature of creation, that is, whether it was "a temporal or eternal process," or whether it was "ex-nihilo or positing some datum," were philosophical and scientific and the Christian faith was indifferent to the answer which was given them. It had been concerned in the past only because of the "supposed bearing" these questions had upon the "authority of the Scriptures. With a better view of revelation, this [was] no longer the case." Although the Christian faith might be indifferent to the theories of creation, and had proved that it could live under many different cosmogonies, it must be in harmony with the prevailing philosophy of its day if it be expected to minister to the needs of society.⁶⁰ These broad

⁵⁹William Newton Clarke, An Outline of Christian Theology (New York, 1898), pp. 128-34, passim. This work had first been prepared as lectures read to his students then printed privately but the general demand for it was so great that a public edition had to be published.

⁶⁰William Adams Brown, Christian Theology In Outline (New York, 1907), pp. 211-14. Dr. Strong described his conception of God in the following terms: "When I speak of evolution as the method of God, I imply that the immanent God works by law; that this law is the law of development; that God makes the old the basis of the new, and the new the outgrowth from the old. In all ordinary cases God works from within, and not from without. Yet this ordinary method does not confine or limit God. He is transcendent as well as immanent" ("Man's Fall and Redemption in the Light of Evolution," Proceedings of the Baptist Congress, Buffalo, N. Y., Nov. 15, 1898, XVI, 6). "There is not the slightest occasion for taking offense at evolution in the scientific sense," said Professor Bowne. "No theist, no Christian even, can have any interest in maintaining that, whatever the method, God is the ultimate cause and source of all things" ("Evolution and Evolution," Methodist Review, LXXV [5th ser. ix] [September, 1893], 696).

and tolerant views emancipated theology from much of the slavery of the past. It could accept the universe as science found it and could lay down its burden of defending a certain date and manner of creation as former generations had been wont to do.

The new attitude toward the Bible growing out of the application of the historical method to its study is too well known to need much repetition here. A world of exegetical difficulty was solved when the scholars ceased to search the Bible for scientific knowledge or test the findings of science by the recorded Word. The strained exegesis, reconciling Genesis with modern evolution, was laid aside as unnecessary. It was looked upon as a sacrilege to treat the inspired Word as a textbook on science. The writers of the Bible knew no science in the modern sense and neither did they couch their teaching in occult terms understandable only in this age of scientific erudition. They described things as they "optically appeared." It was readily admitted that these writers had employed ancient traditions and legends as vehicles for their spiritual truth. The creative narratives could be accepted only as human tradition vitalized with divine truth, for as Professor Clarke said, the old accounts were "too pictorial," they knew too much and "told too much" of the mysteries of God to be taken as literal transcriptions of what had taken place.⁶¹

With the development of the better exegesis of the Bible the old derisive attitude toward the evolution of man waned. Theology felt no longer constrained to defend any definite time or

⁶¹Clarke, op. cit., p. 225. The general ideas attributed to the theologians in this paragraph may be found in many places but the phraseology here used is colored by, W. R. Harper, "The First Hebrew Story of Creation," Biblical World, III, 15-16; President Henry Morton, Ph.D. (President of Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, New York), "Cosmogony of Genesis," Bib. Sac., LIV (April and July, 1897), 264-92, 436-68 (which is a repudiation of the superficial efforts to reconcile Genesis with science).

manner of man's creation. The whole problem was one which belonged to the science of anthropology, and theology was quite willing to "remand the question of time and manner of the origin of man" to the proper science as it had already remanded the question of the origin of the world to its proper science--geology. Theology was well aware by 1900 that if it were to remand the question to science it would receive evolution for its answer. But this no longer disturbed it. The manner of bringing man into the world would not in the least obscure God or degrade man to any "inferior level occupied by nature" but rather nature would be "raised to a higher grade by having man for its supreme outcome."⁶² The old "fruitless protest" against the simian origin of man had given way, said Professor Foster, "to the confidence that the dignity of man" survived regardless of the mode of his origin. Even though man sprang from nature he was not to be looked upon as a "nature-being." He was filled with a "personal supermundane life" which had empowered him from the beginning with new spiritual forces.⁶³ "There was nothing in this view which was considered antithetical to Christianity," for "any view of the origin of man," said William Adams Brown, "which is consistent with his divine sonship and immortal destiny is consistent with Christian faith."⁶⁴

In the consideration of man's moral nature the theologians

⁶²Wm. Clarke, op. cit., pp. 222-25.

⁶³The Finality of the Christian Religion, pp. 243-44.

⁶⁴W. A. Brown, op. cit., p. 239. "But God creates according to the law of evolution," said Professor Wm. Rupp, "and it would be as absurd for the theologian to deny this truth, as it would be for the scientist to deny any creator at all. . . . Did God, for instance, make the first man, but does he not make men now? Are men now less the creatures of God's love and care than was the first man? If God does not make me, then why care I who made Adam, or how he was made? But if God makes things now, and makes them according to a fixed and unalterable law, then the presumption is that He has always made things the same way" ("The Evolution Theory in Theology," Ref. Church Rev., VI [July, 1902], 389).

of the nineties differed somewhat from the attitude held in the decade before. The former explanation that sin was only the left over ape and tiger in man was repudiated as too superficial an explanation. Evolution might throw some light on man's past and the nature of sin but it did not fully explain the problem of evil. The theologians at the end of the century with unanimous refrain, were insisting that the brutal relics did not become sin until the volition of man had played its part. Animal appetites and brutal nature in themselves were not sin. They became sin only when man, using the powers which made him man, showed a preference for the lower instead of the higher. The old doctrine of the fall was either discarded or greatly modified. To Dr. William Rupp, the "fall of the theologians," which posited the "intellectual and moral perfection of man in the moment of creation, and then an instantaneous loss of this perfection, and a sudden plunging into total depravity," could neither be explained by evolution nor by any other theory. Such a view of man was "inconceivable" to modern ethical thinking. "A perfect moral being cannot be created off-hand," he said. "In other words, free personality, can never be an off-hand creation, but must be an evolution."⁶⁵ Dr. Strong belonged to that group whose views had been modified by evolution but who still contended for the old orthodox symbols of truth. To lay all the blame of man's "immoral course" on his appetites, he thought, was to deny that man was truly man. The principle of evolution required one to hold that when man appeared he was man, with his brute instincts under the control of reason and conscience. Because man was an outgrowth of the brute, he was no more brute than the bird was reptile because it too had evolved from the reptilian order. Man was a "creature of free

⁶⁵Wm. Rupp, loc. cit., pp. 391-94, passim.

will" capable of putting the lower impulses under his feet but this he had failed to do in the first original revolt of the human will against God. The proof of this fall, Dr. Strong found in the "long course of depravity and degradation" which he believed had been "universal in human history." This *fall was no natural development but rather a willful departure of the first representative of the race from God and from his law."⁶⁶ Professor Clarke also held that the brute in man was a "source of much of the evil we observe." Yet it involved no guilt for the individual until he had chosen the lower in preference to the higher. But this was not the whole of sin. "The spirit," he said, "has subtle and dangerous sins of its own, in the life that lies above the realm of the brute. The higher part of man has capabilities of moral evil far greater than the brute element ever possessed. The observed sin of the world cannot wholly be defined in terms of animalism."⁶⁷

The evolution of the moral nature of man and the rise of sin involved the theologians in the whole problem of ethics. The

⁶⁶"As regeneration is the new creation of man's moral nature by God," Dr. Strong further added, "so the fall was man's own creation of an evil nature by self-will and disobedience. It was the most tremendous act of volition ever put forth by man. It revolutionized his being. It changed the deepest springs of life. The changed nature was transmitted, for there was no other nature to transmit. Evolution became the evolution of a dwarfed and degraded humanity, or, in other words, Evolution became degradation" [It seems that on this dogma, Dr. Strong was far more conservative than he was on the general nature of God's method of work, cited above. There was something about the whole scheme of salvation that compelled the conservative to shy away from any position that might undermine any of its connected dogmas.] ("Man's Fall and Redemption in the Light of Evolution," Proceedings of the Baptist Congress, XVI, 10-12).

⁶⁷Clarke, op. cit., p. 232. "That which makes sin sin," said G. B. Foster, "is that which makes man man . . . it is only when the personal decision of man . . . of which the naturalistic conception of evolution takes no note, comes into play over against this heritage, that the condition can be properly designated sin" (op. cit., p. 246).

new school of evolutionists was no better satisfied with Spencer's hedonistic explanation of the rise of moral nature than the older half-way evolutionists had been. In 1891, James T. Bixby published his Crisis In Morals, considered his most constructive contribution to the evolutionary discussion. He rejected Mr. Spencer's theory of pleasure and pain as too shallow an explanation of man's moral nature. It furnished too fugitive a base for morals and was too neglectful of the Kantian theory of conscience which Mr. Bixby endeavored to vindicate. Bixby found the moral nature of man imbedded in the very heart of the universe. His general thesis maintained the theory that altruism was as much a part of the structure of the universe as selfishness itself.⁶⁸ Two years later, in his Romanes lectures, Professor Huxley astonished the theologians when he took the stand that the rise of the moral nature of man was independent of the cosmic process. This principle, natural selection, he said, had no part in the evolution of society. If it were applied man would have to exterminate the unfit and adopt the principles of "the stud" in his matrimonial agreements. The influence of natural selection was most pronounced in rudimentary society but social progress meant a checking of the cosmic process. Moral progress had come by combating it and in the adopting of a new principle. "In place of ruthless self-assertion," said Huxley, "it demands self-restraint; in place of

⁶⁸Bixby, The Crisis In Morals (Boston, 1891). A few of his own words might clarify his position: "The moral law is seated in the very structure of the universe; for it is the natural concord which manifests the unity of being, and is as indispensable to social existence as the force of gravitation to the continuancy of the planetary system. Immorality is the discord which appears when the forces of nature have ceased to co-ordinate themselves, and rushing off on their own divided, self-willed paths, terminate in some monstrous birth or despicable ruin" (pp. 199-200). He found altruism in the rudimentary social organization of animals and felt it would be strange for it not to have appeared in man before his development into the proper human rank (pp. 226-35).

thrusting aside or treading down all competitors, it requires that the individual, shall not merely respect, but shall help his fellows; its influence is directed, not so much to the survival of the fittest, as to the fitting of as many as possible to survive."⁶⁹ While the orthodox proclaimed the great Huxley was in retreat, the liberals welcomed the new spiritual note coming from the evolutionist. Benjamin Kidd in his Social Evolution endorsed in principle the same conception as Huxley, that morality had come by the introduction of a new principle, altruism, which he believed had come by the avenues of religion.⁷⁰ Henry Drummond's Ascent of Man, delivered first as the Lowell Lectures in 1894, furnished the trilogy of English writings which were shaping the theologian's conception of evolutionary ethics. In his chapters on "The Struggle For The Life Of Others," and "The Evolution Of A Mother," Drummond identified the ethical process with the cosmic process. There was as much a law of the giving of life for others as there was a law of the struggle for self. Every monad must divide, thus sacrificing its original life, to give life to a new cell. The seed must die in order to bring forth a new plant into the world. The mother must sacrifice herself for her offspring. These altruistic principles were as much a basic part of the cosmic process as the survival of the fittest.⁷¹ In 1896, appeared George Harris' Moral Evolution, one of the best studies on the question at that time. He catalogued the authorities who had thus far written on the problem into four groups. The first group looked on evolution and ethics as antagonistic, on the grounds

⁶⁹Evolution and Ethics and Other Essays (New York, 1911 ed.), pp. 81-82.

⁷⁰Benjamin Kidd, Social Evolution (London, 1894).

⁷¹Ascent of Man (London, 1894), pp. 275-374.

that nature was unfriendly and degrading and that its law of necessity killed all freedom in the individual and made morality impossible. The second group looked on the two as independent because the development of the mental and moral nature had been on a higher plane and under other laws than the law of the great cosmic process. James G. Schurman, Benjamin Kidd, Alfred Wallace, and Thomas Huxley, with varying degrees, fell within this group. The third class regarded ethics and evolution as identical. Morality was considered "simply and entirely one phase of evolution." "Both the origin and development of the moral sentiments" were believed to have come under the "evolutionary method." Harris could not accept this identity, although he believed the degree of truth was greater here than in the first two classes. The fourth class considered evolution and ethics as harmonious and it was with this school that Professor Harris took his stand. The essential feature of his harmony, he found by identifying the goals of "self-preservation" a "fundamental of evolution," with those of "self-realization," which he called, a "whole hemisphere of morality," because it had been discovered that to realize the worth of persons in society constituted morality. This realization could be achieved by either self-love or by love of others, thus rooting it in the "self-regarding" feelings as well as the "sympathetic feelings," or, in self-realization as well as in "altruism." "Harmony," he said, "may therefore be looked for at the very point where antagonism had been assumed."⁷²

As the theologians saw man, body and soul, drawn into the evolutionary process, it was inevitable that the central dogma of the Protestant church, the Atonement, would be reinterpreted more in harmony with the cosmic process. A most penetrating analysis

⁷²Moral Evolution (Boston, 1896), pp. 10, 12-26, 155-56.

of the effect which evolution had had on the doctrine of redemption, and anticipating closely the trend theologians were to take in the future, was delivered by Dr. H. H. Peabody of Rome, New York, before the Baptist Congress, meeting in Buffalo in 1898. "If character is a product of God in evolutionary methods," he said, then redemption must come through the same process. Growth in moral character required that we start again and again after each failure. Redemption in the light of evolution was no mere escape from some external doom. Neither did it begin with the cross on Golgotha but rather with the first sin and the first sinner in the earliest stirrings of primitive altruism. Evolutionary theology "tells us," Dr. Peabody said,

the redemption is not a dramatic episode alone, rather than the dramatic episode is a manifestation of a universal law. It says that redemption is not something at last done to save the world--an intervention in an undivine life--it is rather another and still another step in a process as old as the foundation that proceeds from the heart of an infinite pater-nity.

The struggle to achieve this redemption is a spiritual conflict within the individual. The old forensic court scene of Calvin is gone, "the tragedy of the court being all within." It is through a realization of the good that the old sins, once desired, drop into disuse and the individual, standing on a higher plane, finds himself at one with God. All the Christian virtues possessed by the human race have developed through this evolutionary process and we call them Christian because, said Dr. Peabody,

that in Christ they shine so perfect. He met the law of mutual service so divinely as to entitle Him to be called the Savior of mankind. He gave no law of sacrifice, only met it. He made no new virtues, only glorified the old ones. In doing the will of God he put himself under the law of moral evolution, and became the culminating feature of its divine order. He was not a moral intervention, simply a fulfiller of the love eternal.⁷³

⁷³H. H. Peabody, D.D., "Man's Fall and Redemption in the Light of Evolution," Proceedings of the Baptist Congress, Buffalo, N. Y., Nov. 15, 1898, XVI, 33-34.

SUMMARY

No hard and fast demarcation lines between the different stages of the evolutionary controversy can be drawn. Only approximate limits can be set, when it may be said that a certain phase of the struggle predominated among leaders of the church. In the sixties and early seventies the weight of their influence was concentrated on discrediting the scientific claims of Darwinism. In the seventies, in general, they were mainly concerned with emphasizing the atheistic and infidelic nature of evolution, with a mild form of compromise proposed, the main intent of which was to show that the old faith remained intact regardless of the outcome of evolution. Then too this same decade was a period in which theologians maintained the independence of Christianity from exact science. Its faith, they said, rested on its own foundation and the proof of it was just as exact and scientific as that of physical science. It should also be observed that this same kind of attack and apology was still being made in the late nineties but by a different element of the church. In the eighties the main force of the attack on evolution centered around the evolution of man and the ethical and philosophical import of Darwinism. The liberal apologists in this decade accepted evolution and attempted to reinterpret Christianity and its dogmas in the light of the new science. One group found complete identification of the laws of religion with the laws of science, while another element was content with drawing analogies between the principles of evolution and the teachings of Christianity. These methods ran their course by the end of the century. In the nineties the leaders of the church ceased to fight evolution. The apologists

began to shift from an exact scientific proof of Christianity to a proof built on the moral force of Christianity in the world and on the redemptive experiences of the individual. It was a period of harmonious adjustment. Evolution might be inconsistent with the old theology but not with the old faith. Religious truths were reinterpreted in the fuller historical knowledge of how man and his institutions had come to be.

In estimating the part that the major denominational groups played in meeting the evolutionary crisis, the first place would have to be given to the Congregational Church for leading in the struggle to harmonize Christianity with the new knowledge which science was producing. There were a number of Unitarian leaders who went further than the Congregationalists in accepting evolution but they did not have as much influence with the evangelical bodies. The efforts of Beecher, Abbott, Munger, Smyth, Johnson, King, and even Wright, have been sufficiently treated to show that no other group of men was as important as it in helping Christianity adjust itself to evolution. The Presbyterian denomination, because of its doctrinal emphasis put up the most stubborn, the most persistent and no doubt the ablest fight against evolution. This judgment is made in spite of McCosh's liberalizing influence. Hodge, Patton, and a host of polemical editors continued with unrequited zeal against the theory to the end. In the Baptist group there was much opposition but the leaders who early opposed it took a less excitable attitude than that found among the Presbyterian leaders during the same period. Herman Lincoln, Samson Talbot, Lemuel Moss, and E. Nisbet, as well as editor Justin Smith of the Standard opposed evolution but they were so convinced of the eternal verities of Christianity, interpreted as they had been accustomed to interpret them, that they refused to become panicky

over the dangers of evolution. The Methodists never took a leading part in the fight against evolution nor a great interest in it comparable to that displayed by the Congregationalists and Presbyterians. They opposed it as a matter of course but here, too, there were moderating influences from such men as Chancellor E. O. Havens, Professor Wm. N. Rice, editor Whedon of the Methodist Review and the conscientiously religious layman, Alexander Winchell. The New York Christian Advocate followed a cautious policy. In the seventies it seemed to be more concerned with skepticism and infidelity in general than with evolution in particular. Neither did the Methodists play a great part in the adjustment of Christianity to evolution. The pragmatic nature of the denomination which turned its interest toward organization and expansion rather than doctrines may partly explain this lack of interest. The Methodists like the Baptists drew the bulk of their people from the less intellectual elements of the population who, although opposed to evolution, were more or less inarticulate. The Baptists at the close of the century took as large a part and produced as much original thought in adjusting Christianity to evolution as any group. Special mention should be made of the part which the small group, The German Reformed Church In America, played. Under the candid thinking of Dr. William Rupp and the more moderate J. S. Stahr and Theodore Appel, it made a considerable contribution to the evolutionary discussion. The heritage of Philip Schaff's liberalism had carried over from Mercersburg and had kept the group at Lancaster from falling into the extreme narrow paths of orthodoxy. The part played by the Lutherans and the numerous other denominations was rather negligible. There was bitter opposition but no outstanding influential leader who transcended the circle of his own group in warring upon evolution

or in leading Christianity into a better relation with modern thought.

The resistance of the theologians was not a sin unique and peculiar to the theologians alone as one might gather from the passages of Andrew D. White's Warfare of Science With Theology, but a part of human nature. It is natural for man to resist the encroachments of new ideas, which in turn support the status quo out of which he draws not only his daily bread but his very spiritual sustenance. The theologians were no more stiff-necked and stubborn than political economists, and economists who have resisted ideas which threatened to destroy the system which they believed was absolutely necessary for the support of civilization and society itself. This does not excuse them for the stubborn resistance they made but it at least explains that the theologians are not the only sinners in Israel, nor the only ones who are the last to accept new theories.

The theologian's problem of accepting evolution was made primarily difficult because of the conception which he had in regard to the Scriptures. Here was a literal record of how things had come to be and on this record he had built his whole towering system of Christian dogmas. As long as he held to the original view of the Bible he must either bitterly oppose evolution as a manufacture of the devil or turn mental somersaults reinterpreting the plain language of his inspired book to force it to agree with evolution. He was in constant intellectual difficulty and spiritual travail until a new point of view toward Genesis could develop, which came along pari passu with the evolutionary struggle by the application of the historical method to the study of the Bible. Once this view of the Bible was grasped, the evolutionary controversy resolved itself into a scientific question

which must be remanded to the scientists for settlement. When once its proof was established it was seen that evolution would, of course, destroy some of the old religious concepts, fill others with richer significance, and cause other completely new intellectual symbols to develop in order to express the relation which man's spirit has with the divine. In the light of evolution, this was not disturbing, for it was seen that religion had always been undergoing these adjustments, even though its communicants might not be aware that the process was going on.

The religious leaders probably moved faster and further in the period from 1860 to 1900 than in any other similar forty years of religious history. It was a long far call, to draw only one comparison, from the conception of the immanent and spiritual actions of the Deity held by 1900 from that of the average theologian of 1860, when the anthropomorphic actions of God were as glibly described and talked about as the doings of the neighbor across the fence. This familiarity and assumed knowledge of the actions of the Infinite were almost a sacrilege to the awed reverence of profound theologians in 1900, who, like the psalmists of old or modern philosophers, were not certain they could discern his ways in all their details.

It is very difficult to estimate what effect this readjustment of religion to science had upon the church and upon church attendance because there were so many other factors operating that the effects which are seen cannot all be laid at the door of evolution. Too many other agencies were bidding for man's intellectual and moral interests. There is, though, much truth in the warning which the Chicago Tribune gave to Beecher. It said that the man of the street would not be intellectually subtle enough to pick out the true from the false in the Bible and in

the dogmatic system as Beecher might. Once you started to undermine one part of it, it would mean the collapse of the whole system to him. Then too it must be borne in mind that the old orthodox epic story of man's fall and redemption was child-like and easily grasped in its main story outline, whether anyone ever understood the metaphysics of it or not. It is much more easily understood than the ethical ideals and means of salvation worked out in harmony with the cosmic process. The latter is too philosophical and in one way too costly for trusting souls who had been accustomed to sing "Jesus paid it all." A dole in the field of soteriology is preferable to a work relief. But the ability of Christianity to adapt itself to contemporary thought enabled thousands to remain faithful to its cause who otherwise would have been lost.

The opponents of evolution have made so much noise crying down evolution that the general public has forgotten or never knew that there were able men who accepted evolution and labored to adjust religion to it. The writer has found many "educated" people surprised to learn that there had been such a movement in the nineteenth century. This study will not have been made in vain, if in time it can bring to light the work that has been forgotten by the popular mind if not by the student of history.

